REMARKS

Claims 3-12 are pending in the present application. In this amendment, claim 3 is amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claim 3 is objected for depending from a canceled claim, in this case, claim 1. Applicant thanks Examiner for the careful reading of the claims and finding this informality. Claim 3 is corrected to depend from independent claim 12. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claim 3 be withdrawn.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 4, 8-11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Evensen, et al. (US 2003/0153332, hereinafter "Evensen"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 12, as previously presented, recites as follows:

> *A handling method <u>after updating of privacy profile of a target UE, the method comprising:</u>*
>
> *A. <u>when the location service (LCS) system is aware that the privacy profile of the target UE was updated,</u> for a location request in activated state against that UE, <u>the LCS system performing a privacy check,</u> if the location request passes the privacy check, going to step B, otherwise going to step C;*
> *B. the LCS system continuing to handle the location request until the end of the handling process of the location request;*
> *C. the LCS system initializing a cancellation procedure to the location request*

Emphasis added.

Applicant respectfully submits that Evensen <u>fails to</u> disclose or teach, either expressly or impliedly, each and every element of claim 12.

Firstly, Applicant respectfully submits that Evensen fails to disclose or teach any "handling method after updating of privacy profile of a target UE" as required by claim 12.

Evensen is directed to providing enhanced user privacy, as is evidenced throughout the disclosure of Evensen. For example, Evensen at page 1, par. [0002] recites "the present invention is directed to a system and method for providing enhanced user privacy when utilizing Location Services (LCS) in mobile telephone networks." As another example, Evensen in summary portion further states "The present invention provides a solution for providing enhanced user privacy for LCS services based on the existing network architecture" (see page 2, [0015]). Furthermore, Evensen recites "<u>the present invention is directed to</u> a system in a mobile communication network for<u> providing enhanced user privacy when responding to a location request</u> from a client" and "<u>the present invention is directed to</u> a method in a mobile communication network <u>of providing enhanced user privacy when responding to a location request</u> from a client requesting location information for a mobile terminal" (see page 2 [0016-0017], which are cited and considered by Examiner in this action). Clearly, Evensen mainly addresses to the provision of enhanced user privacy, specifically when responding to a location request.

However, as recited above, claim 12 is directed to a method <u>after the update of the privacy profile of a target UE.</u> That is, claim 12 is related to handling/processing after the privacy profile is updated. In contrast, as discussed above, Evensen is directed to <u>providing enhanced user privacy when responding to a location request</u>, which is very different from and cannot be regarded as the same or equal to the handling after updating of privacy profile

of a target UE in claim 12. Furthermore, Evensen <u>is silent</u> about whether the provision of enhanced LCS profile being handled after the user profile is updated or the like.

Accordingly, for at least the above reason, it is respectfully asserted that Evensen fails to anticipate claim 12 or render it obvious. However, for the consideration of procedure efficiency, some other alternative arguments are provided as follows.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Evensen fails to anticipate the elements "<u>when the location service (LCS) system is aware that the privacy profile of the target UE was updated</u>, for a location request in activated state against that UE, <u>the LCS system performing a privacy check</u>" of claim 12. Clearly, claim 12 requires that the LCS system performs the privacy check on the location request for the target UE <u>when it is aware the update of the UE's privacy profile</u>. That is, in claim 12, <u>the privacy check is performed after the privacy profile of the target UE is updated.</u> By contrast, as discussed above, Evensen does <u>not</u> mention or give any suggestion about change or update of the user profile, nor providing an enhanced user profile that is performed when/after the user profile is updated.

Therefore, it is submitted that Evensen fails to disclose these elements in step A of claim 12, nor render these elements obvious. Thus, claim 12 is new and patentable over Evensen.

In rejecting claim 12, the Office Action at page 3, second paragraph, states as follows:

> Regarding claim 12, Evensen discloses a handling method after updating of privacy profile of a target UE, wherein, <u>when the location service (LCS) system is aware that the privacy profile of the target UE was updated,</u> the method comprising the steps of: A. For a location request against that UE, the LCS system performing a privacy check, if the said location request passes the privacy check (reads on <u>codeword matching</u>)... (see page 2 [0016-0017])

However, Evensen at page 2, [0017] (emphasis added) recites:

> The method <u>begins</u> when the location request from the client is received by the mobile location node. The location request includes an identifier for the requesting client, a codeword, and a service identity. <u>This is followed by sending</u> from the mobile location node to the HLR/HSS a request for routing information that includes the codeword from the location request. <u>The codeword is then compared</u> with a list in the HLR/HSS of approved codewords associated with the mobile terminal. The location request is then accepted only if the codeword included in the location request matches a codeword from the codeword list.

From the cited portion, as well as many other portions throughout Evensen, e.g. [0032-0035] and steps 1, 2 and 3 of FIG. 3A, clearly, in Evensen, the cited <u>codeword matching</u> is performed after the request message for routing information is sent from a mobile location node to the HLR/HSS, which in turn is after the location request from the client to the mobile location node. However, as discussed above, in claim 12, the privacy check is performed when the LCS system is aware of the updating of the privacy profile, which is not disclosed or taught expressly or inherently by the cited paragraphs or any other portions throughout of Evensen.

Therefore, at least for any one reason discussed above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Evensen does not disclose or teach, expressly or impliedly, all the elements of claim 12, or render these elements obvious. Thus, claim 12 is believed to be allowable over Evensen.

Claims 5-7 are considered to be allowable. Claims 3-4, 8-11 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12 and add additional limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable over the reference of record in view of their dependence on an allowable claim as well as the additional limitations which are also not anticipated or suggested by Evensen.

For example, claim 3 directly depends from claim 12 and further defines that if there are more than one location request for the target UE in activated state, step A is repeated until privacy check for all the location requests for the target UE in activated state have been completed. That is, in claim 3, for each location request against the target UE, the LCS system shall perform a privacy check, which is also not disclosed or suggested by Evensen. Examiner simply asserts in the action that FIG. 3A of Evensen anticipates the further elements of claim 3. However, it cannot be seen how Evensen anticipates these additional elements in claim 3.

As another example, claim 4 directly depends from claim 12 and further recites "the LCS system performing a privacy check based on the updated privacy profile of the target UE." That is to say, claim 4 further specifies that the privacy check is according to the updated privacy profile of the target UE. As discussed above, Evensen does not mention updating of the user privacy, nor updated user privacy, even no updated codeword is mentioned.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed or rendered moot. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Ira S. Matsil, Applicant's attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are due, or credit any

overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

February 10, 2010
Date

/Ira S. Matsil/
Ira S. Matsil
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 35,272

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas   75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218